

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 14, 19 and 20 are amended. Claims 14, 19 and 20 are amended to recite features supported in the specification on page 26, lines 17-26. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Pokrzywa during the June 27, 2003 interview. The points discussed during the interview are incorporated in the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that claims 1-3, 5, 7-13 and 18 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants also appreciate that the Examiner indicated that the June 10 Amendment appeared to obviate the Office Action rejection of claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, Applicants assert that all of pending claims 1-3, 5 and 7-20 are allowable for the reasons discussed below.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 14-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,157,706 to Rachelson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rachelson does not teach or suggest an internet facsimile machine capable of executing facsimile transmission via an internet to an addressee using a computer installed with an application program for execution of internet facsimile transmission, including analyzing means for analyzing a data structure of data of address information registered on the basis of an electronic mail application program which is already in operation, reading means for reading the data of address information analyzed by the analyzing means, wherein the data of address information for a first address of the addressee is distinguished from the data of address information for a second address of the addressee, and format converting means for converting the read data of address information into address information with a

format used on the application program for execution of internet facsimile transmission, wherein the application program for execution of internet facsimile transmission and the electronic mail application program are independently operating application programs using the computer, as recited in claim 14, and similarly recited in claims 19 and 20.

Instead, Rachelson discloses an administrative site 100 for enabling a facsimile machine to send and receive e-mail. Specifically Rachelson teaches the administrative site 100 communicating with an EPO 112. The site 100 includes an STMP server 224 for receiving and sending e-mail messages to and from an internet site 170, as well as InMail and OutMail processes 1002 and 1004. The e-mail attachments are decompressed and/or unzipped and/or converted to TIF format. See col. 10, lines 33-64 and Figs. 1, 10 and 11 of Rachelson. There is no teaching or suggestion of distinction of multiple e-mail addresses for an addressee, as recited in Applicant's claimed features.

A claim must be anticipated for a proper rejection under §102(a), (b) and (e). This requirement is satisfied "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." See MPEP §2131. The Office Action fails to show that Rachelson anticipates Applicants' claimed features.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 14, 19 and 20 are now patentable over the applied reference. Dependent claims 15 and 16 are likewise patentable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman  
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Date: July 8, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--